



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

TEXT-BOOKS

Notes on British History. By William Edwards. Part IV. *From the Treaty of Versailles to the Death of Queen Victoria, 1783-1901.* (London, Rivingtons, 1910, pp. xii, 641-1050, xxiii-xli.) This is a cram book, but a most excellent one. It is not simply a list of events, but it states adequately the causes of the events and their results. It also arranges the facts under distinct topics, instead of merely following the chronological order. This necessitates some repetition, but the plan is worth more than it costs. Further, the writer gives a summary of the career of each of the prominent men of England in the nineteenth century which is well worth while. The book is also very inclusive. It treats of the entire empire, and not merely of Great Britain; it gives summaries of foreign events, where these in any way involved Great Britain; it treats not only of political history, but of the history of religion, education, public health, science, trade, and industry. In every one of these respects the book commends itself for its completeness and usefulness.

It can be said, too, that the writer is wholly unpartizan, whether he is treating of home or of foreign politics. It would be difficult to determine from his book what opinions Mr. Edwards holds either in politics or in religion.

The author furnishes a bibliography with each summary. But these bibliographies are extremely limited, and quite inadequate, at least for the use of American teachers. Moreover, the books cited are not always the best for the purpose.

The accuracy of the work is admirable. Of course mistakes are inevitable in a book of this character. Naturally they are more frequent in the summaries of foreign affairs than in those of domestic affairs. I note the following: The quotation from Fox on page 653 is not exact; the statement that the peasantry under the Old Régime retained only eighteen francs out of every hundred earned is probably incorrect (p. 657); the representatives of the people were not "refused admission to the Assembly by the nobles and clergy" in 1789; on page 660 Place de la Révolution should be Place de la Nation; Jacobins should be Montagnards (p. 660); it would be more accurate to say 75,000,000 francs instead of 60,000,000 (p. 678); the summary about Germany (pp. 805-806) seems to me inaccurate; "1812-13" on page 692 should be "1812-14"; "American ship" (p. 694) should be "American man-of-war"; Ney did not promise to bring Napoleon to Paris "in an iron cage"; a summary of the French Revolution which does not mention Danton is inadequate. The facts about Schleswig-Holstein (p. 852, par. 1) are all wrong. On page 854, under (3), Hongkong should be Canton; Lincoln was not an Abolitionist (p. 857), nor were the Abolitionists in a majority in Congress in 1860 (p. 356); Northerners on page 859 should be United States; the pope was left with something more than the Vatican after

the taking of Rome in 1870 (p. 307) ; while what Edwards says about the outcome of the Venezuela affair (p. 978) does not seem to be quite correct.

RALPH C. H. CATTERALL.

English Political Institutions: an Introductory Study. By J. A. R. Marriott, M.A., Lecturer and Tutor in Modern History and Political Science at Worcester College, Oxford. (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1910, pp. viii, 347.) "This book", says Mr. Marriott, "is intended as an introduction to the study of English Politics. . . . My primary object has been to set forth the actual working of the English Constitution of to-day, and to do so with constant reference to the history of the past." The work is well done and on the whole successfully done. Marriott has undertaken to classify constitutions, to point out the salient features of the English Constitution, to discuss the executive, legislative, and judicial powers, to treat of Parliamentary procedure, of local government, and of the relations between the British state and the empire. In every case he has preceded the political science of his subject with its history. Of course everything he says is based upon secondary sources, but the books he relies upon are the best in their various fields and he shows a thorough comprehension of what his authorities are talking about. His remarks on the growth of the executive at the expense of the legislature, on the powers of the crown to-day, and on the distinctions between constitutional law and constitutional conventions, though not original with him, are well stated and properly emphasized.

The book will be useful to all teachers of the subject in elementary classes. For their use, it could hardly be better. The criticisms to be made are few and mostly have to do with matters of detail. The writer fails occasionally to give references which are sufficiently exact. For example, a reference to Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion* is not a sufficient reference. He is a little careless, too, in his verbatim quotations. Moreover, it is not scientific to quote from the Grand Remonstrance or the Petition of Right as if they were authorities for the facts of Charles I.'s reign. I do not agree that the absence of the monarch from the cabinet is one of the marks of the cabinet. It was necessary to the growth of the system, but that is all that can be said. In speaking of the three estates, Marriott always names the nobility first, which is incorrect. The clergy is always the first estate. What he says about the power of the House of Lords in the eighteenth century does not seem to square with what he later says about the power of the Commons in the same century. Chapter v., on the Civil Service, seems to me inadequate. The power to elect a mayor was not first granted to London in Magna Charta.

RALPH C. H. CATTERALL.